



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of time and space we cannot hope to exhaust the fullness of the world. But there is a difference between complete satisfaction and no satisfaction at all. If the ideal is never actualized here, yet it need not altogether elude us. So long as he has strength, the plain man is content to go on working as well as he can. Something is accomplished; and he is not unhappy. Why be like an unwholesome schoolboy who is always counting the number of hours until the holidays, and never enjoys them when they come? But time forbids me to pursue these reflections any further. I trust that my arguments have not been unfair. But a book which makes nonsense of life must expect unveiled hostility. We do not want a philosophy "which finds bad reasons for being what we cannot help being" (p. 201), and then spurns human experience, permitting, if anything, what seem the deepest and truest views of life to be retained merely on scientific sufferance. We want an idealism which, having reached some peak of speculation, can tell us the true relations of what we from the valleys see fitfully amid the storm and the mist. But for the true philosopher, as for the poet and the artist, we must await the favor of heaven. In the meantime, however, there is employment for the humble spade-worker. He may prepare the ground for the new seed, by trenching diligently and trying to subvert the luxuriant aftermath of the last philosophical harvest.

ALFRED J. JENKINSON.

HERTFORD COLLEGE, OXFORD.

SCHOLARS OF THE CLOISTER: A DEFENCE.

IT is one of the commonplaces of history that spiritual or ecclesiastical Rome did not fall with material, political Rome. The Roman Church was a product at once of Latin and of Christian influences, being in its splendid organization a special tribute to the Roman Law and in its peculiar power a witness to the vitality which the spirit of Christianity gave to the Law, and in consequence it was able to withstand the barbarian

hordes that brought destruction to Rome's temporal power and conquering one leader with his numberless following after another to turn defeat into victory. An old story, that has at least the truth of legend, was thus once more enacted; the floods came, but the church rode safely upon the devastating waters and saved to the world the life, the thought and the achievement of the past. Monarchs and nations arose and politically they had or claimed to have independent sovereignty, but spiritually they were avowed subjects of the Pope, the members of one empire. In order the better to understand this do but reflect how even in very modern times Christianity is constantly giving evidence of its great vitality. In its Protestant as well as in its Catholic form it still retains an imperial sway. Now also, as then, men abuse and try to subvert its imperialism, hiding their own selfish ends under its spiritual truths, but in the first place men are never quite as bad—nor yet for that matter quite as good—as they seem, and in the second place the true empire simply grows in power, while the false empires, as if pagan in spite of their modern dress, rise only to fall again, suffering defeat after defeat.

Towards the close of the eighth century Charlemagne rose in power and according to all the historians he stands out as the supreme representative of this spirit, which was peculiarly mediæval, of subjection of the secular to the ecclesiastical, of the natural to the supernatural. He was "at the same time feudal lord and dearest son of the Catholic Church." All of his great social and political successes he turned to the advantage of the church, and by no means the least important example of his devotion was his interest in the Cloister Schools, which he may even be said to have established. There had been schools before, and at his time there were many, some pagan and some Christian, but his Cloister Schools, besides being under Christian control, developed rapidly into places where men came to be thinkers as well as reciters and copyists, philosophers as well as priests. The philosophy, moreover, which found expression among them is generally known as Scholasticism, while the philosophers themselves were the Schoolmen.

Scholasticism, whose special doctrines and controversies may be set aside for the moment, established itself, as well it might in view of its origin, upon the principle: *Credo ut intelligam*; and many would argue that such subordination of reason to the church would result in almost anything but philosophy. I must, then, say at once with emphasis that Scholasticism was philosophy; in disguise perhaps, but still philosophy. The fact is that philosophy always begins in just such disguise. It always seeks to justify what men are believing. Contrary to popular prejudice it is always the friend of faith, seeking not the overthrow of creeds and traditions, but only fulfilment of them by discovery of their inner truth, by liberation of their spirit from the confining letter. Thus Scholasticism was philosophy serving Christianity by liberation of its spirit.

Of course this is hardly the common view of Scholasticism, which it has been the fashion to abuse roundly. At least until more recent times anything like a devotion of reason to faith has been very offensive to our age of "pure" science. Scholastic has even been a word of sharp reproach, which—for example—reviewers have among the more convenient epithets of their professional, mayhap "scholastic" repertory. But I shall certainly be understood when I say that the conceit of the present is never a safe basis of judgment of the past. The formal phrases, the mere intellectual gymnastics, the enslaved reason of the Scholars of the Cloister are to my mind much more the creations of an overbearing imagination of to-day than the findings of true history. Only approach Scholasticism with an open mind, which means—among other things—with some sense of the conditions of its time, and one is sure to find in it human life and passion, expression of the freedom of the human spirit.

Above I did allow myself for the moment to take the more conventional view and speak of the spirit of subjection as the characteristic spirit of mediævalism and I was even so bold as to refer to so great a genius as Charlemagne as the supreme representative of this spirit, but I was telling only half of the truth. Suppose in these times—and of course this is more than

a mere supposition—schools should be founded and should even be held strictly to the service of some cult, political or religious; then not only would their influence be to make a blind faith see but also in the very fact of their establishment there would be conclusive evidence that faith had already lost some of its blindness, that the prevailing ritual and creeds and institutions of life had already become, at least in some degree, symbolic. Let us know, say those who found and those who attend schools, perhaps Cloister Schools, perhaps modern universities or even sectarian colleges, what these outward signs really mean.

And are we to forget that Charlemagne himself, so true to the spirit of mediævalism and first patron of Scholasticism, by common consent was a man who added to his powers as a political leader and to his services to the church a love of learning for its own sake? "The eagerness," says one writer,* "with which this extraordinary man applied himself to acquire learning for himself and to extend it throughout his dominion is truly admirable, when we remember the enormous labors in which he was engaged." Or, again, are we to forget, as if children ashamed of their old-fashioned parents, that our modern Christianity grew up as a fulfilment of the mediæval Christianity, that our modern science, *even* our modern science, grew up as a fulfilment of that "dark, church-ridden, phrase-bound" thinking of the Scholastics?

But take the worst view possible, if you must, and suppose in those mediæval times no freedom of life, no freedom of thought. Suppose the Cloister Schools were only the nurseries of priests, where the scriptures and other manuscripts were copied, illuminated, committed to memory, where arguments were contrived in slavish support of creeds, where men hurled their Latin phrases back and forth in mere chivalrous rivalry for the favor of the church. Would all this have borne no fruit? The penitent was going to the confessional once, twice, a thousand times, and in the end found, what perhaps he had never really lost, his own conscience. The alchemist and the astrologer were busied with their mystic arts, and in the end

*A. T. Drane, "Christian Schools and Scholars," ch. 5.

came to a sense of law in nature. Tillers of the soil, by their very submission to nature, were becoming mechanics, skilful and independent. The subjects of kings were themselves learning the art of government and so making ready for democracy. People everywhere were living with reference to the hereafter, only in time to become convinced that the future life, the other world, was all but come, and then, as if in answer to their beliefs and prophecies, that after all it was only a fuller and deeper expression of the life here and now, a larger and broader relation to the present world. And, with all these changes, can we suppose that the Scholars of the Cloister, reverent and devoted as they were in their subjection to the church, never turned from copying to thinking, from proving only what they believed, to believing only what they proved? Why, service, be it never so implicit, always sets men free; and so surely does the time come—as it came to the church—when the master must choose between subjection to his own slaves and sympathy and coöperation with them, that we have to doubt if they ever were really enslaved. Might, I know, often seems to be all that makes right, but then also weakness needs leadership, and leadership, even the severe leadership of might, strengthens and liberates. The simple principle that action has its equivalent reaction is not less true of might in the relations of men than of force in the relations of things physical.

Schools require books, text-books or their equivalent; and the Cloister Schools were not behind in this respect. They had the Bible of course and in those days there was a good deal of patience with the Bible. They had also other books or manuscripts of a directly religious character. But besides their Christian literature they had the pagan literatures and upon these they became more and more dependent, notably—if not notoriously—upon the works of Aristotle, which came to mediæval Europe in part through the Arabic and in part through the Latin. Was the church lacking in foresight when it admitted the pagan writers to its schools? Possibly; but, if so, the mistake was made centuries before, when Greek thought and Christian or Hebrew thought met in Alexandria

and became so involved in each other that the Bible itself, as we have it even to-day, is a monument to their relationship. Whatever may be said of Christ himself, of Christ the Hebrew, Christianity both scriptural and doctrinal was a result of the unification of Mediterranean life openly begun by Alexander and completed by Cæsar and, to vary a familiar phrase a little, what God had joined together the Christian Church, however powerful, could not possibly put asunder. Indeed the Christian church could not even wish or will a separation. Besides, was the church that had conquered so many barbarian hordes likely to fear or even to have any reason to fear defeat through pagan manuscripts? The Schoolmen themselves, as if with the reverence that supernaturalism feels for all the things that are as well as particularly for its peculiar objects of worship, or perhaps even out of a feeling of justice to the facts of history, were wont to think of the literature at their command as the Word, the Logos. Hence their patience in copying, illuminating and annotating. Hence, too, as already suggested, the presence in mediævalism of something more than a mere mediæval Christianity. But the use of the pagan authors in the Christian Schools was fraught with momentous consequences. Unconsciously, implicitly it was an argument from the natural to the supernatural and it had all the effects of such an argument. It naturalized the supernatural and ever more and more clearly men came to recognize what it had done.

In so many ways the mediæval church seems to have defeated its own interests. It converted barbarians only to adopt their architecture and to incorporate into its customs many of their traditions and myths. It instigated the crusades only to have the crusaders return from the Jerusalem which they never really reached more secular and cosmopolitan than ever. It fostered painting and letters only to turn faith toward the life of Christ into a rational regard. And it cherished the Cloister Schools only to produce a Giordano Bruno, who insisted on finding God in nature. What, then, can one say but that the church was always building better than it knew or perhaps

that back of what the historians can see there was in the church what we have come to call the modern spirit?

Dates always blind one to true history, but if dates are now asked, the Scholars of the Cloister belong to the period between Charlemagne of the ninth century and Louis XIV. or Oliver Cromwell of the seventeenth. Some put the end of the period much earlier; some even later; and some are not sure that the end has yet been reached. For my part I should not feel safe in saying that it really had. Nothing is more interesting than the way in which all the old-time periods of history have lengthened out in recent years, as historians have seen more clearly and more deeply.

Names are also blinding, creating as they do invidious distinctions, but it has been common to recognize as most important John Scotus Erigena, Roscelinus, Abelard, Albertus Magnus, Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus and William of Occam. These men, according to their special teachings, were Realists, Nominalists or Conceptualists, terms which refer directly to different views of the import of a general or class name, a common noun. Does the common noun imply a reality, as if a universal type or standard, that exists quite apart from individual things and is accordingly of quite a different substance, being spiritual or ideal, or is it only a name, only so much breath, a mere convention with no reference at all beyond the individual things to which it is applicable? Realism took the first position, believing in the real "universal"; Nominalism took the second, believing in the only nominal "universal"; and Conceptualism saw truth in both positions, suggesting in so many words that God's natural philosophy would be Realism, while man, talking and writing of what he can not see, has no choice but Nominalism. For man "universals" can be only after-thoughts. Scholasticism, then, was a doctrine or a group of related doctrines of the "universal," and its phrases *universalia ante rem*, *universalia post rem* and *universalia in re* were the weapons of many exciting tourneys. Yet, if I were to stop here, the mediæval philosophy might seem to some to deserve all the opprobrium that has

been cast upon it and the lofty claims which I have already made to be quite without foundation.

So let me say at once that those wonderful tourneys were more than mere Scholasticism—if I may adopt the abusive use of the term. In our own day the psychologists have been disputing in an abstract over-technical way about pleasure and pain and one might very easily imagine that their disputes are only so much idle “Scholasticism,” but how wrong such a view would be. A doctrine of pleasure and pain, however abstractly formulated, is a doctrine of heaven and hell and the psychologist in his modern cloister, the study or the laboratory, is only taking his part in the development of the new theology, for which the pure enjoyments of the traditional heaven and the unmixed agonies of the traditional hell are as impossible morally and spiritually as pure or unmixed pleasure and pure or unmixed pain are impossible psychologically. So the centre of Scholasticism may have been the doctrine of “universals,” but in its mediæval form as well as in its modern Scholasticism had a circumference as well as a centre.

The more recent histories of politics and economics, to mention no others, give at least external evidence of this, for they are as much concerned with the Schoolmen as the histories of technical philosophy. The Canonist Doctrine, for example, is mediæval and scholastic, but it is the subject of an important chapter in Professor Ashley's “English Economic History,” showing that the Schoolmen did not confine their interest to those Latin phrases. Also in the following manner, that may be mentioned here, although with a slight digression, Professor Ashley shows respect for Scholasticism. “It is to be observed,” he says (p. 380), “that the conception of political economy as primarily a ‘science’ is one that dates only from Adam Smith; and that even English economists have of late found it impossible to restrict themselves to purely ‘scientific’ exposition. Moreover even English economists are finding it necessary to take into account certain popular conceptions, such as that of ‘fair wages,’ which the last generation of economists contemptuously disregarded; and these conceptions are in many cases essentially the same as those which influenced

the mediæval theologians. If there is this slight link of sympathy between the Canonist of the Middle Ages and the English economists with an influential group of recent German economists the bond is far stronger. For they, at any rate, are ready to allow that political economy ought to 'treat material interests as subordinate to the higher ends of human development'; and, although the modern definition of these 'higher ends' may differ from the mediæval, in recognizing the need of an ethical standard they occupy substantially the same ground as their theological forerunners." Excuse so long a quotation, and then regret, if possible, its important witness to a modern Scholasticism or—the same thing—to a modern spirit in the mediæval Scholasticism.

But in another way than that of the value of the Schoolmen to economics and politics and in a way even more to the point we can see that the technical doctrine of "universals" was not a centre without a circumference. A doctrine of language or rather of the import of the terms of language may assume very technical form, getting to be as academic or as cloistered as you please, but no power on earth can prevent its becoming in time as general, as far-reaching as human life. Language is only one of the means, or media, of man's self-expression; it is only one of the "ways" by which man has to go; it is the medium of his spoken and written thought; but the "ways," the media, are of indefinite number, and only as we apply Scholasticism, doctrine of mediation that it was, to them all can we truly appreciate it. Apply it to the ritual of the church, to the exactions of government, to the conventions of literary composition; apply it to the person of the king, who set himself up as politically the universal individual; apply it to the person of Christ, who spiritually was the universal individual; apply it to Latin among the languages, to Rome among cities, to the Bible among books, to gold among commodities; and you will begin to see that the scholastic philosophers of the Middle Ages, albeit in an abstract over-technical way, were discussing an issue that was not less vital than that of pleasure and pain, of heaven and hell. In those Cloister Schools between the Realists who held that language was burdened with

the truth of another world and so that man need but slavishly repeat its dead phrases in order to bring his thought into touch with reality, and the Nominalists who held that language was simply a convention, a device of man, the conflict between absolutism and democracy, with all that these imply for political life and religion, for literature and for science, had been fought out, as if in rehearsal, before its open expression, with which history is so much more familiar, in the great upheavals that made modern Europe.

And when one fully appreciates this Scholasticism once for all must cease to be the thing of the past which so many imagine; it ceases to be a mummy in an historian's museum; it lives and breathes with the life, the invigorating atmosphere of all genuine thought. Thought is always life preparing for a leap, and while it may for a time seek the seclusion of a cloister and protect itself still further by abstraction of its subject matter and technicality in its method, it is bound sooner or later to break from its self-imposed bonds and enter with its strength into the larger sphere of passionate human life.

Scholasticism dead? No more than science is to-day. The Cloister Schools bound to the service of the church? No more than our modern places of learning, our universities and colleges and public schools to the same service. The Schoolmen themselves not thinkers? In their academic retirement and in their academic way they rehearsed, as all thinkers rehearse, the life that was to come.

Credo ut intelligam is the principle of thought now as well as then. Now, as then, understanding as it comes only justifies faith, liberating the spirit from a confining letter. Do I destroy history by thus bringing past and present together? Possibly, but at least I give a real meaning to the unity of human life.

ALFRED H. LLOYD.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.